UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,327	09/02/2003	Chih-Wei Chen	LA-7196-125	2925

167 7590 10/22/2007
FULBRIGHT AND JAWORSKI LLP
555 S. FLOWER STREET, 41ST FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER	
SIKRI, ANISH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/653,327	CHEN, CHIH-WEI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anish Sikri	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan et al (US Pat 7,082,464) in view of Champagne et al (US Pat 5,333316).

Claim 2, 6 is rejected under rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan et al (US Pat 7,082,464) in view of Champagne et al (US Pat 5,333316), and further in view of Ramamurthy et al (US Pat 7,080,077).

Claim 3, 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasan et al (US Pat 7,082,464) in view of Champagne et al (US Pat 5,333316) and in further view of Ezaki et al (US Pat 7,072,954).

Consider **Claim 1**, Hasan et al discloses a network-linked computer platform configuration data access management method for use on a network-linked computer platform that is provided with at least one management function and linked to a network system linked to a number of system administration workstations (Hasan et al, Col 3 Lines 58-65, Col 4 Lines 9-13, Fig 1, Fig 2, Fig 4, Fig 5, Fig 8), for the purpose of allowing a group of system administrators to browse the configuration data of each management function of the network-linked computer platform (Hasan et al, Col 5 Lines 65-67, Col 6 Lines 1-7) at the same time while allowing only one system administrator to modify the configuration data of the same management function at the same time

(Hasan et al, Col 15 Lines 33-67, Col 16 Lines 1-67); the network-linked computer platform configuration data access management method comprising: establishing a table data module, which is a data-only module used to store the current-access-status property of each management function of the network-linked computer platform (Hasan et al, Col 16 Lines 1-67); in the event of any one of the system administration workstations issues a management function modification request, querying the table data module to determine whether the management function being requested for modification is currently being accessed (Hasan et al, Col 16 Lines 1-67).

But Hasan et al fails to disclose clearly if NO, generating an modification-permit message; if YES, generating an modification-inhibit message; in response to the modification-permit message, performing an access-status registration procedure to set the current-access-status property of the requested management function to TRUE in the table data module; and then permitting the requesting workstation to gain access to and modify the configuration data of the requested management function; and in response to the modification-inhibit message, performing an modification-inhibiting procedure to inhibit the requesting workstation to modify the configuration data of the requested management function.

Nonetheless, Champagne et al discloses if NO, generating an modification-permit message; whereas if YES, generating an modification-inhibit message (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51); in response to the modification-permit message, performing an access-status registration procedure to set the current-access-status property of the requested

management function to TRUE in the table data module (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51); and then permitting the requesting workstation to gain access to and modify the configuration data of the requested management function (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51); and in response to the modification-inhibit message (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51), performing an modification-inhibiting procedure to inhibit the requesting workstation to modify the configuration data of the requested management function (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51). Champagne et al's invention clearly shows when an object profile in a database is locked, and how the computer platform will incorporate modification-permit message or modification-inhibit message to the security administrator. Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the security steps taught by Champagne et al in the computer platform, taught by Hasan et al, for the purpose of preventing conflicting access to configuration objects of the database.

Consider **Claim 4**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Hasan et al as modified by Champagne et al clearly discloses the access-inhibiting procedure allows the system administrator at the requesting workstation to view the contents of the configuration data of the requested management function but not to modify (Hasan et al, Col 15 Lines 33-67, Col 16 Lines 1-67). Hasan et al clearly shows on how the access control scheme

can allow the administrator to have no access, read access only, or read and write access to any specific part of the management database.

Consider **Claim 9,** and as applied to claim 1 above, Hasan et al as modified by Champagne et al discloses wherein the management function includes a group of subset functions individually assigned to have their own current-access-status, allowing different system administrators to access the subset functions at the same time (Hasan et al, Col 15 Lines 33-67, Col 16 Lines 1-67). It is clearly shown that different administrators can access the subset functions concurrently.

Consider **Claim 10**, and as applied to claim 9 above, Hasan et al as modified by Champagne et al fails to disclose wherein all of the subset functions individually are collectively assigned to have the same current-access-status property, such that if a certain subset function is currently being accessed and modified by a system administrator, then all the other subset functions will be inaccessible for modification by any other system administrators.

Nonetheless Champagne et al discloses all of the subset functions individually are collectively assigned to have the same current-access-status property (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51), such that if a certain subset function is currently being accessed and modified by a system administrator, then all the other subset functions will be inaccessible for modification by

any other system administrators (Champagne et al, Col 1 Lines 62-67, Col 2 Lines 8-26, Col 5 Lines 11-52, Col 6 Lines 29-51).

Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to shows on how the computer platform prevents functions by other users/administrators, when the subset function is being modified by system administrator at that time, taught by Champagne et al in the system of Hasan et al, for the purpose of maintaining data integrity and preventing corrupted data/system.

Consider **Claim 2**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Hasan et al as modified by Champagne et al fails to disclose a timing procedure, which is capable of being activated to count time for a preset timeout length promptly after the system administrator at the requesting workstation starts modifying the configuration data of the requested management function, and which is further capable of generating an modification-inhibit message at timeout to inhibit access to the configuration data of the requested management function. Nonetheless, Ramamurthy et al's invention clearly discloses a timing procedure (Ramamurthy et al, Col 46 Lines 4-25, 57-67, Col 47 Lines 1-17), which is capable of being activated to count time for a preset timeout length promptly after the system administrator at the requesting workstation starts modifying the configuration data of the requested management function (Ramamurthy et al, Col 46 Lines 4-25, 57-67, Col 47 Lines 1-17), and which is further capable of generating an modification-inhibit message (Ramamurthy et al, Col 46 Lines 4-25, 57-67, Col 47 Lines 1-17) at timeout to inhibit modification to the configuration data of the requested

management function (Ramamurthy et al, Col 46 Lines 4-25, 57-67, Col 47 Lines 1-17). Ramamurthy et al's invention clearly shows on how grace periods can be incorporated into the computer platform when it comes to users/system users accessing data. Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement timeout procedure of Ramamurthy et al in a computer platform, of Hasan et al, as modified by Champagne et al for the purpose of enabling grace timeouts which is able to lock (modification-inhibit) the data after some pre-determined time access from the users/system users.

Consider **Claim 3**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Hasan et al as modified by Champagne et al fails to disclose the management function configuration data includes authorized user profiles, hard disk settings, and system security settings. Nonetheless, Ezaki et al clearly discloses the management function configuration data includes authorized user profiles, hard disk settings, and system security settings (Ezaki et al, Col 4 Lines 38-52, Col 6 Lines 21-30). Ezaki et al's invention clearly shows a facet of system security files, which are used on a computer platform. Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the security/configuration/profile steps taught by Ezaki et al in the computer platform taught by Hasan et al, as modified by Champagne et al, for the purpose of configuring the system(s).

Claims **5-8, 11, 12** have similar limitations as to claims **1-4, 9, 10** respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational as to claims **1-4, 9, 10**.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Sikri whose telephone number is 571-270-1783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anish Sikri
a.s.

October 11, 2007

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100